

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 27-29, 32-35, 48, 49, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Anthony Vanelli, "An Adaptation of the Interior Point Method for Solving the Global Routing Problem," IEEE Transactions on Computer Aided Design, pages 193-203, Vol. 10, No. 2, February 1991 ("the Vanelli Article"), in view of USP 6,412,102. Claims 30, 31, 50, and 51 were rejected as being unpatentable over the Vanelli Article in view of USP 6,412,102 and in further view of USP 6,516,455. Claims 36-47 were allowed.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 27 and 48, and added claims 53-64. Accordingly, claims 27-64 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Objection to the Summary

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to two informalities in the Summary. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended the Summary per the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request approval of the proposed amended Summary.

II. Claims 36-47 and 53-64

In the Office Action, the Examiner deemed claims 36-47 to be allowable for "the inclusion of identifying and solving the LP or ILP problem to select one identified propagation permutation for each route in each sub-region traversed by the route within the method of routing nets". Applicants respectfully acknowledge this finding. In this Amendment, Applicants have added claims 53-64, which are similar to claims 36-47, except that claims 53-64 recite computer readable media. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 53-64 are allowable just like claims 36-47.

III. Claims 27-35 and 48-52

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 27-29, 32-35, 48, 49, and 52 under § 103 as being unpatentable over the Vanelli Article, in view of USP 6,412,102. Claims 30, 31,

50, and 51 were also rejected as being unpatentable over the Vanelli Article in view of USP 6,412,102 and in further view of USP 6,516,455.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 27 and 48 to clarify that the solving operation recited in these claims solves an LP problem in order to propagate routes defined with respect to a first set of sub-regions into a second set of smaller sub-regions. Applicants respectfully submit that these amended claims, and the claims 28-35 and 49-52 that are dependent on them, are patentable over the cited art for the same reason that the Examiner cited for allowing claims 36-47. Namely, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because amended claims 27 and 48 recite solving LP or ILP problems to propagate one set of routes that are defined with respect to a first set of sub-regions into a second set of smaller sub-regions. The cited art does not disclose, teach, or even suggest the inclusion of such a solving operation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 11/12/03

Mani Adeli
Reg. No. 39,585

Statler Johansen & Adeli LLP
PO Box 51860
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.102
Fax: (650) 752-0995